DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 782 EA 017 287

AUTHOR Drake, Jackson M.
TITLE Improving Teacher Performance through Evaluation and Supervision.
PUB DATE 7 Feb 84
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (68th, Las Vegas, NV, February 3-7, 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Role; Due Process; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Principals; School Supervision; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Rights; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Instructional Leadership

ABSTRACT

To guarantee an efficient educational system, effective evaluation and supervision of teacher performance are necessary. However, the evaluation of teacher performance presents two major problems: first, no clear definition or measure of effective teaching exists, and second, evaluation is perceived to have conflicting purposes, either as a stimulus to teacher improvement or as a basis for advancement, retention, or dismissal. Accordingly, this paper reviews contemporary issues that bear on teacher evaluation, recommends evaluation procedures, and provides guidelines for effective instructional leadership. After an opening discussion of issues, such as the demand for accountability and the access/quality dichotomy in education, the four conventional approaches to evaluation are reviewed: (1) evaluation by "good traits," (2) evaluation based on skills and competencies, (3) product (outcome-based) evaluation, and (4) the service-contributions approach. Because all these are inadequate, a threefold evaluation procedure is recommended: (1) conferring with the teacher to establish goals, (2) devising an implementation strategy, and (3) ascertaining that the goals have been achieved. Clinical supervision is then discussed as a preferable alternative to in-class supervision, and due process requirements for fair evaluations are delineated. Characteristics of an effective principal are discussed next, followed by a summary of reasons for staff appraisal. The author concludes that strong instructional leadership by the principal, including supervision and evaluation, is the key to an effective school. A 47-item bibliography is included. (TE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED250782

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jackson M. Drake

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# IMPROVING TEACHER PERFORMANCE THROUGH EVALUATION AND SUPERVISION

by

**JACKSON M. DRAKE**
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

EA 017 287

## NATIONAL ASSOCIATION of SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

**68th ANNUAL CONVENTION**

**LAS VEGAS, NEVADA**

**FEBRUARY 3-7, 1984**

Return To: Jackson M. Drake

# IMPROVING TEACHER PERFORMANCE

# THROUGH

# EVALUATION AND SUPERVISION

by

Jackson M. Drake
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

National Association
of
Secondary School Principals

68th Annual Convention
Las Vegas, Nevada
February 7, 1984

Education is one of the largest industries in the United States. It involves every person at some time during his/her lifetime. Moreover, education involves from twenty-five to thirty-five percent of the population at any given time. It is reasonable to assume that because of the involvement of such a high percentage of the population, the educational system must function as effectively as possible. One way to help guarantee this is through effective evaluation and supervision of teacher performance.

Research indicates that there is nothing more important to quality education than an effective staff. In the 60's and 70's, there was a high degree of teacher turnover which allowed a more accessible entree for desired changes in education. Today, however, since school faculties have become relatively stable, school reform and change must be accomplished by working with existing personnel. This fact, along with a public concern for accountability, has led to a new emphasis on evaluation and supervision.

This paper in no way suggests that educational leadership at the principalship level in the past has been lax or ineffective. The large majority of positive citizens coming from our nation's secondary schools makes that criticism unfounded. The fact is, however, the challenges of today -- and those of tomorrow -- aren't those of yesterday. Help in obtaining new skills, attitudes and knowledge in what improvement of teacher performance is all about.

Community and governmental demands for visible education results, effectiveness, and efficiency have resulted in a growing number of legislative mandates designed to make the educational system more accountable to the public. Teacher accountability has been a major legislative and judicial activity. The public wants evidence that teachers are effective

in their jobs or that efforts are being made to either improve their performance or remove them. In an attempt to hold teachers accountable for performance and effectiveness, various proposals for teacher evaluation and minimum competency testing have been adopted by boards of education and state legislatures.

Although no one would question the importance of good teaching to the provision of good education, the appraisal of teacher performance has presented numerous and nettlesome problems. One major problem inherent in teacher evaluation is that there is no clear definition of what characterizes an effective teacher or constitutes effective teaching and, consequently, no definitive measures to be used for teacher evaluation. Any evaluation process is essentially a comparison of desired outcomes with actual outcomes. If the situation exists where not only the results but in many cases the desired outcomes are in question, then the task of evaluation becomes extremely difficult.

A second major problem in teacher evaluation emanates from what often are perceived as being the conflicting purposes of evaluation. On the one hand, evaluation is perceived as having positive results such as the improvement of instruction and the identification and encouragement of effective teachers. However, in the lexicon of the teacher, evaluation often has been viewed as a basis to make nonretention, demotion, reassignment, or dismissal decisions. The situation created by these varying interpretations often generates negative feelings between those being evaluated and those doing the evaluating.

Accountability

We are in an era of accountability. The public sector has come under scrutiny and budgets have been cut to the bone as a result of inflation and taxpayer resistance. Consolidation of gains and the opportunity for

continued experimentation and improvement in the quality of educational programs call for documentation of successful outcomes. Hence, school administrators are being increasingly called on to do instructional program evaluation.

At the same time, state governments are beginning to play an increasing role in educational management by requiring more and better planning and accounting by school districts. School districts are being asked to state their goals, assess their needs, and measure their outcomes in order to see how effective and efficient their educational programs are. Hence, from "above" as from "below" the press for instructional program evaluation is on.

Assumptions Concerning Teacher Evaluation

1. Teacher evaluation, as it presently exists in most school districts, does very little to improve the quality of performance and instruction.
2. There are two effective methods of changing teacher behavior:
   a. A traumatic, supervisor-initiated, data-based, narrowly focused, "THOU SHALL CHANGE OR ELSE".
   b. A positive, data-based, broadly focused, consultant-client relationship between the supervisor and the teacher, "THOU MAY CHOSE TO CHANGE AND I WILL HELP YOU".
   *Each of these methods require a different procedure.
3. Evaluation for the improvement of instruction and teacher performance takes a commitment from the district for human and material resources;
   a. Training of evaluators (time and money)
   b. Allocation of administrative staff for evaluation time, and this will cost money.
   c. Staff development program for teachers and this will

also cost money.

4. Active involvement of teachers in the performance evaluation process can be a KEY to their commitment to the system.

Access vs. Quality

The access/quality dichotomy is a specious and dangerous one. Arguments in its favor usually take the following form. As access to public education increased in the 1970s, the quality of education declined. If educators seek to increase further the quality of education in the coming decade, they risk limiting access to our educational system. But there is no reason to think that quality and access cannot work together. Even if handicapped children, for example, do not score as well as children without handicaps, access to education has unquestionably increased the quality of education available to handicapped children. Removing such students from the mainstream of education might raise the mean scores of the remaining students -- but at an unacceptable high cost.

In the last two decades especially, a key task of U. S. public schools has been to increase access for all youths, regardless of race, sex, or social class. This represents a major achievement for the U. S. and a major improvement in quality of life for its citizens.

Let us consider the matter of access in another way: In 1950 approximately 55% of white students graduated from high school, whereas 30% of black students graduated. Today, 85% of white students and 75% of black students are graduating from high school. Moreover, various economists have estimated that between one-quarter and one-half of the increase in the U. S. gross national product over the last two decades can be attributed to the increased educational level of the workforce.

In addition, more U. S. youngsters are enrolled as full-time students than youths in most other western nations. About 75% of U. S. youths aged

15 to 19 are full-time students. In France that figure is 51%, in Germany, 51%, in Great Britain, 44%; and in Italy, 40%.

All of these trends bode well for the public schools. Despite the concern about the new importance of private and independent schools, these institutions still are educating only 10% of U. S. students while 90% attend public schools. Moreover, recent increases in the birthrate - particularly in sunbelt states - are creating an increased interest in education at local and state levels, as well as teacher shortages in some sunbelt states.

Dale Mann, professor of Educational Administration, at Columbia University identifies three assumptions held by most people who work with schools:

1. First. . . . people can be changed . . . and education is one way in which people are changed.

2. Second . . . people are rational and they direct themselves toward goals and use information to govern their actions.

3. Third . . . people in education share values and goals that guide efforts for change in schools.

One of the beautiful things about education, as we practice it, is that we believe in Improvability. This is what we are all about. Improvability of the instructional program that results in greater student achievement and growth cannot become a reality unless YOU have the same belief in your own improvability, and above all, your faculty and staff.

Just believing in improvablility is not enough. Two or three memorandums from your desk indicating that you support the concept will NOT convince many people. YOU are going to have to be out in front leading the staff in every dimension of the school program that is directed toward improvement of teacher performance.

Most principals inherit their staff. Your staff, most likely was intact when you were appointed to the principalship, and it is likely that many of them will still be there after you are gone. What does this mean?

It means that you had better work diligently at assessing the strengths and needed areas of improvement of every faculty member you have, and then to cooperatively, professionally and systematically develop a PLAN that enhances and building upon their strengths and provide opportunities to "shore-up" the areas that need attention.

Principals dedicated to the purpose of becoming more effective and not simply surviving are finding they MUST shift from remedial management emphasis to an emphasis on anticipatory and prescriptive management. To do this, principals need a systematic approach toward the improvement of teacher performance through Evaluation and Supervision programs which combines the best research findings with practical applications so faculty and staff can enhance learning options for students.

Evaluation has always been troublesome for school administrators. It has been troublesome for teachers. Both profess the value and necessity for evaluation, but neither believes that it can be effectively accomplished.

Several years ago Donald Thomas, Superintendent of Schools in Salt Lake City made a succinct statement when he said:

> "Teachers want to be evaluated on the quality of their performance - not on how they dress, how they smile, or how influential they may be in the community."

As we all know, many school districts have devised elaborate evaluation programs based on unimportant items. Evaluation should be individualized to each teacher and should relate to teacher effectiveness. Any evaluation or supervision program which does not demonstrate and produce better educational services to students is only a futile exercise.

The task of identifying effective teachers or effective teaching is crucial to Teacher Selection, to Teacher Performance, and ultimately to the Survival of the Human Society. Yet today no general agreement exists as to

what constitutes effective teaching, and no standards of teacher effectiveness are commonly agreed upon. This dilemma will not be tolerated by the general public or state legislatures as we move into the last half of this decade.

Let me briefly explore two rather simple basic assumptions. Both are extreme.

1. Evaluation is subjective. . . . period.
2. Evaluation is objective and that subjective evaluations have a negative effect on teachers and students.

You don't have to be Phi Beta Kappa, have a high M.A.T. or G.R.E. score to know that if any common ground can be reached, it will necessitate a sincere effort that will result in an intelligent compromise. In the meantime, teachers and you as administrators must have the courage to develop evaluation and supervision methods and strategies which are satisfactory to both.

Evaluation By "Good Traits"

Early in the game, teachers were evaluated on the basis of traits and attributes. For many years we as administrators had the idea that effective teaching was almost completely related to good grooming, or good speech or good looks, or a pleasant personality. Let me be quick to say that I am certainly not adverse to any of these "good traits" as long as they are placed in proper perspective. Later, more sophisticated programs related good teaching to good grades in College, certain levels of degree attainment, or high scores on the National Teachers Examinations' Record.

Extensive lists of so-called "good traits" were developed and teachers were marked good, average or poor on the basis of these traits as observed by those of us who had been identified as "Superiors". It was generally assumed that as "Superiors" we possessed the "good traits" to a high degree and were, therefore, able to judge their existence in other people. An examination of such lists almost always reveals that the following charac-

teristics are considered to be important in evaluating teachers' effectiveness:

1. Grooming, personal appearance, appropriate dress.
2. Pleasant and unpleasant mannerisms.
3. Alertness and enthusiasm. Appears to enjoy work.
4. Possesses a sense of humor.
5. English usage, appropriateness.
6. Judgment, originality, adaptability.
7. Self control
8. Open minded; weighs all evidence.
9. Fair, and objective in dealing with students.
10. Punctuality. (One that appears on almost every list)

In addition - this particular evaluation usually requests that teachers attend all professional meetings, read professional journals, be willing to accept majority decisions, and be supportive of all school district decisions. More emphasis on compliance than on good teaching; more emphasis on Personal Idiosyncracies than on the quality of services performed for the benefit of students.

This kind of evaluation is not without some merit but, it treats educational personnel as stereotypes rather than as individual men and women. No research has ever demonstrated that good teachers necessarily possess a particular trait or cluster of personality traits. Good or effective teachers are individuals who possess these traits in varying degrees; the good teacher is not a statistical mean.

It must be admitted, however, that there is in all occupational fields some positive correlation between quality of performance and such items as intelligence, emotional adjustment, and energy levels. This is a prima facia, common sense conclusion.

Evaluation Based on Skills and Competencies

Especially popular have been the so-called process scales developed as a result of Lewin, Kippitt, and White Climate Studies. It was assumed that good teaching occured when a certain climate existed in the classroom. Thus evaluation methods were developed that concentrated on an observation of what occured in the classroom between teacher and students. The teacher was evaluated on such items as:

1. rapport with students
2. democratic behavior
3. ability to organize
4. ability to prepare adequately
5. ability to inspire
6. ability to develop self-direction in students
7. ability to present clear and definite assignments
8. ability to ask clear and concise questions
9. ability to tolerate tension
10. ability to personalize discipline

Again, there is no body research. No convincing evidence that this kind of evaluation identifies good teaching. Nor is there any evidence that good teaching can be segmented and evaluated by a study of certain skills or the existence of certain classroom conditions. The excellent work of Ned Flanders and his interaction analysis approach is yet to be validated, is extremely costly, and requires long hours of observation for each evaluation. At best it is a correlation study on pupil well-being and not a method of identifying effective teachers or effective teaching.

Product Evaluation

In recent years, a number of school administrators have begun to consider product evaluation methods, thus trying to imitate industry, evaluation is

centered on Student Achievement, Test Scores, Profiles, the number of students failed, and other forms of so-called "objective data" concerning what happens to students.

The Service - Contributions Approach

In some school districts evaluation has incorporated an examination of contributions made to the community, to the institution (district), and to the profession. In secondary school and college positions, teachers have been evaluated on the basis of offices held, writings published, speeches given, honors obtained, and number of times that names have appeared on conference programs. No one would argue that these are important, but teachers are primarily employed for teaching services. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that good writers are good teachers, nor that good speakers are good teachers, nor that good public relations persons are good teachers. Good teachers may, in fact, have these qualities; but they are good teachers because they perform well as teachers and give excellent service as teachers when dealing with students in the classroom. Many extremely good teachers have never written an educational article for publication. Many good teachers have never held a professional office. Many good teachers have not joined local clubs, etc. Such accomplishments should not be given short shrift, but they are not adequate measures for good teaching.

Each of the methods mentioned-

1. traits and attributes
2. skills and competencies
3. test scores and product analysis
4. awards and contributions

evade the real area to be evaluated. Teaching is a service much like doctoring, accounting, or legal counseling. The value or quality of the service can best be evaluated by knowing what is to be achieved, by performing

services to achieve it, and by having the learner validate the result.

Recommended Evaluation Procedures

Donald Thomas suggests that one of the most significant steps towards establishing an effective evaluation relationship with teachers is the establishment of trust and mutual respect.

1. Meet with each teacher individually to establish what are the expectations from the teacher for the school year. You may call these goals, standards, objective, etc., it really doesn't matter. What is important is that there is a "meeting of the minds" between the teacher and the principal on certain things to be accomplished during the year. What needs to be accomplished could be in the area of:

   a. student achievement
   b. classroom environment
   c. pupil control
   d. teaching strategies
   e. or whatever you and the teacher feel is important

Many teachers feel anxious about a performance-selling meeting. New teachers especially may have real concerns. If you, as a principal, observe a few rules, these anxieties and concerns will be greatly diminished:

   a. put the teacher at ease with a friendly attitude. and supportive comments.
   b. resist the temptation to take over and tell the teacher what to do.
   c. avoid talking about past performance, you are attempting to jointly establish what must be done educationally during the current year.
   d. ask questions and let the teacher do most of the talking.

e. formalize into a written document what you agree must be achieved during the school year.

f. indicate in general and specific language what assistance that the teacher may need in order to succeed in attaining the objectives.

2. After the objectives or standards have been established, the teacher should be requested to program toward the objectives and to provide educational services that will attain the mutually agreed on objectives. It is important that the principal assess progress being made and not be surprised in the Spring. If a teacher is not doing well, they usually need help in one or more of these areas: knowledge, skills, attitude, discipline, or motivation. Help should be provided, but help can be provided only when the principal observes or talks often enough with the teacher to know that help is needed.

3. By the end of the school year, the teacher should have data to validate that the objectives have been achieved. Validation data can be of various forms - testing being only one possible form. The kind of validation data needed is dependent on what the goal is:

a. Student achievement can be validated by standardized tests, by teacher-made tests, by student art forms, by pupil achievement profiles, by student performance, etc.

b. Classroom environment can be validated by student attitude scales, by observation reports, by video tapes, by class-loss records, etc.

c. Teaching strategies can be validated by motivation levels, by observation, by video tapes, by self-perception reports, by follow-up studies, etc.

Needless to say, it is usually better to have a combination of validation data than to rely only on one form of data.

If Thomas two basic assumptions are correct: that the task of identifying effective teaching is crucial, and that there is no general agreement as

to what constitutes effective teaching - we have no time to lose.

The difficult job of developing effective evaluation programs is before us. What is now required is less wailing at the wall and more attempts at doing the job.

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision emphasizes individual professional growth and development while, in contrast, traditional in-class supervision emphasizes the negative defects of the individual. Charles A. Reavis makes a succinct point when he suggests that:

> Practitioners of clinical supervision assume that teachers possess the drive and personal resources to solve their own problems. Clinical supervision is categorized as a five step process that aims at helping each teacher identify and clarify problems, receive data from their supervisor (principal) and, most important, to develop solutions with the aid of the supervisor.

Teacher attitude toward clinical supervision tends to be more positive than traditional supervision. Traditional supervision all too often casts the supervisor in the role of a superior teacher explaining to the teacher what needs to be changed and how to change it. Clinical supervision tends to produce a self-directed teacher resulting in a more positive relationship between the teacher and the supervisor.

Clinical supervision is a tested, researched alternative to in-class supervision as generally practiced. However, there are specific skills that must be mastered if the clinical supervision model is to be effective. Mastery of these five steps is essential.

1. Pre-observation conference
2. Observation
3. Analysis and Strategy
4. Supervisory Conference
5. Post-conference analysis

Genuine colleagueship and good communication skills are also important. A school system wishing to adopt the clinical supervision approach is well advised to plan a thorough training program for those in supervisory roles. The benefits to improve instruction will be well worth the efforts.

The difference between successful and unsuccessful educational programs is related to these environmental factors:

a. local school involvement in the decision-making process;

b. the Principal's leadership and support from community and superiors;

c. a "critical mass" of teachers who share attitudes and values;

and

d. the use of local ideas orginated in each individual school.

*The total school environment figures prominently in such major studies of school effectiveness as the British research report, Fifteen Thousand Hours, as well as in a number of similar studies in the U. S. These studies seem to agree that educational improvement occurs at the building level and that the most important single factor in school improvement is the leadership of the individual school principal. In addition, schools must provide for parent involvement, and some easily communicated definition of quality of student performance must be available.

It is inevitable if strengths and weaknesses are to be identified, and if the teacher is to be given constructive counsel as to steps to be taken in order to improve performance. Whether appraisal in a school system goes on consciously or unconsciously, formally or informally, methodically or unsystematically. IT DOES GO ON - day by day. It will go better, however, if the significance of appraisal is recognized and IF accepted as a necessary function of the administrative process and IF particular attention is paid to

problems created by its use. Teachers want to be considered professional in decision making and in self-realization and, most of all, they want to be evaluated on the quality of their performance just like other professional persons. Good teachers welcome an evaluation methodology that:

1. agrees on the goals to be achieved,
2. states how achievement of the goals are to be validated, and
3. allows for modification of goals with change in conditions.

No Time To Lose

Whether we like it or not, appraisal and evaluation are the major functions of secondary school principals and the entire administrative process. They are attempts to determine effects of plans, policies, procedures and programs in terms of organizational purposes. Thus appraisal and evaluation of the instructional program is vital to improvement of teacher performance.

Legal Implications Related to Teacher Evaluation

L. Dean Webb writes in a December 1983 NASSP Legal Memorandum that there exists no real conflict between effective evaluation practices and due process rights of teachers. Due process considerations are consistent with the goal of evaluation which IS TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION. Due process speaks to fairness. In teacher evaluation fairness implies that:

1. the teacher knows what standards of performance are expected and what criteria and procedures will be used in the evaluation.
2. evaluations take place within reasonable time frames.
3. adequate notice of evaluation results is provided.
4. the reasons for an employment decision or notice of remediation is needed, is of such clarity as to provide the teacher direction for correction.

5. a reasonable time is given to carry out prescribed improvement.

6. the teacher is given a chance to improve.

7. the evaluation if of a form and nature to provide substantial evidence for employment decisions.

If these elements of FAIRNESS are incorporated into a school district's evaluation policy, employment decisions will be more defensible and individual and school improvement in the quality of instruction will be facilitated.

Three main factors contribute to the need and demand for effective evaluation and supervision of teacher performance.

1. The public is playing a larger role in demanding educational reform and accountability. Schools must answer these demands by attempting to implement improved programs that require new attitudes and skills on the part of the current staff.

2. Districts with declining enrollments and a low degree of teacher turn-over must concentrate on developing existing human resources.

3. Routine retraining is necessary to accommodate and implement discoveries and approaches in the field of education.

The Effective Principal in Action

More than seventy-five research studies, in answer to the question: Why are some principals more effective than others?, identified eight recurrent behaviors. They are:

1. Demonstrating a commitment to academic goals.

2. Creating a climate of high expectations.

3. Functioning as an instructional leader.

4. Being a forceful and dynamic leader.

5. Consulting effectively with others.

6. Creating order and discipline.

7. Marshalling resource.

8. Using time well and evaluating results.

The effectiveness studies suggest that the Principal has an important role in "setting the tone" of the school as an orderly, purposeful, organized and pleasant place to work.

The late Ron Edmonds, Professor at Michigan State, established a pentalogue of "The Effective School" using as a yard-stick, the percentage of students who attain minimal mastery of Basic Skills.

THE BIG FIVE - CHARACTERISTICS

1. First and foremost is a strong principal who spends most of his/her time (out of their office) observing classes and adopting a "collegial" manner in settling instructional problems. MBMA - "Management By Moving Around".
2. A clear sense of Institutional purpose.
3. An orderly educational climate - broken windows - graffiti on walls, etc. must be replaced or erased rapidly - and everyone, faculty, staff and students MUST feel responsibility for the school.
4. High expectations of teachers for students and -
5. Willingness to "measure students" performance objectively with standardized tests.

Principals have a difficult job. The demands are varied and many. No other responsibility is more important than visiting with teachers and attempting to improve the services performed. Whatever else you do, it is imperative that you find time to talk with each teacher and plan the work of the school. After all, success or failure of schools is largely determined by what teachers do with students in classrooms and not by what we do in administrative offices.

Summary of Reasons for Appraisal

In the day to day course of administering the affairs of a school system, the principal finds that judgments of organizational personnel are inevitable. While there are many reasons for appraising individual performance, a compelling one is to improve the effectiveness of each staff member so that he can contribute maximally to the attainment of purpose.

The reasons for appraisal are numerous but here are several that seem to be worthy of close attention and concern.

1. Place the individual in the organization where he can render maximum service to the school system.
2. Improve performance.
3. Undercover abilities.
4. Ascertain the potential of the individual to perform various kinds of tasks.
5. Point up in-service education needs.
6. Determine whether the individual should be retained in the organization on a permanent basis.
7. Transfer, promote, or dismiss personnel.
8. Provide a guide for salary advancement.
9. Test the validity of the recruitment and selection process.

Few people, if any, question the need for appraisal of individual performance. The real problem is to develop and improve valid appraisal procedures. A second problem is to create greater understanding of the limitations of appraisal devices so that results derived from them will NOT be misused.

In searching the literature for various personnel appraisal techniques we find various techniques are often employed to appraise the professional

performance of school personnel. These include:

1. Teacher self-evaluation.
2. Evaluations of teachers by school administrators.
3. Evaluations by supervisors or department chairman.
4. Evaluation of colleagues.
5. Evaluation by pupils.
6. Evaluation of teachers on the basis of concrete evidence of the character of instruction (Regents Exam.).
7. Evaluation of teachers on the basis of cumulative personnel responses.
8. Evaluation of teachers by means of questionnaires and examinations.

Analysis of the foregoing techniques for appraising effectiveness of professional personnel indicates that most are designed to appraise teacher behavior or concomitants considered to be related to instructional effectiveness. Each method has proponents and opponents. Each has alleged advantages and disadvantages. Regardless of the plan used to appraise the performance of professional or non-instructional personnel, the ultimate aim should be to improve the service rendered by the individual to the school district. The appraisal process which FAILS to do this falls short of achieving its primary purpose.

Conclusion

Research is now revealing what many of us have known for more than thirty years. The principalship is the KEY to an Effective School. The position of the principal is now being analyzed and lionized as never before. This is an opportunity and the time is ripe for the principal to assume a leadership role and responsibility for improving teacher performance through evaluation and supervision. The principal will be expected once again:

to lead; to improve their schools, and to speak up and to define requirements and standards. However, if we are not careful, the opportunity could be lost as William Jennings Bryan noted: "Destiny is not a thing to be waited for. . it is a thing to be achieved".

The principal's central role is the quality of the educational program. I know first hand the entire range of expectations that fall upon the principal. Nevertheless, time must be set aside to ensure that students are receiving instruction of the highest quality considering the resources at hand. Fortunately, most of the national reports recognize that the principal holds the KEY leadership role in achieving educational excellence.

The concept of effective evaluation and supervision focused upon the improvement of Teacher Performance needs to move from:

1. What it is . . . to what it can become.
2. Improvisation to preparation.
3. Indifference to involvement.
4. Aimlessness to a resolve to fulfilling the needs of both staff and the organization through improved evaluation and supervision.

As principals perceive evaluation and supervision of teacher performance as an OPPORTUNITY, progress can become a reality. During the last three days, you have laughed, you have comprehended, and you have shared the joys of being. Let us not curse the darkness because we have frustrations - because things are not as they used to be - because our jobs are complex and demanding - because there is change - because there is ambiguity. Instead - let us search for new answers and new directions because we have responsibilities and opportunities that transcends all else.

In summary . . . .in the immortal words of P O G O, "We have met the enemy . . .and it is us". If education is to work well, that MUST change. It is time for all segments of society to be a part of the solution.

WHAT A CHALLENGE! WHAT AN OPPORTUNITY!

REFERENCES


Baldwin, G.H., Defending Educations Values: The Administrator and Systematic Evaluation Research. NASSP Bulletin. November, 1981.

Beckman, J.C., Legal Aspects of Teacher Evaluation. National Organization on Legal Problems of Education. 1981.

Berger, E., The Evaluation of Teachers. NASSP Bulletin. January, 1974.

Blecke, A.E., Encouraging Teachers' Support for Teachers Evaluations. NASSP Bulletin. December, 1982.

Bolton, D.L., Evaluation of Administrative Personnel In School System. New York: Teachers College Press, 1980.

Burke, R.L., Improving Instruction with Management by Objective and Clinical Supervision. Contemporary Education. Fall, 1977.

Drake, J.M. and Miller, B.P., Determining the Competencies, The Expanding Role of the Principal in the 1980's. NASSP Bulletin. 1982.

Duke, D.K., What Can Principals Do? Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness. NASSP Bulletin, October. 1982.

Dunkleberger, G.E., Helping Teachers to Grow: Classroom Observations--What Should Principals Look For? NASSP Bulletin. December, 1982.

Garawski, R.A., Collaboration is Key: Successful Teacher Evaluation Not a Myth. NASSP Bulletin. March, 1980.

Greenfield, W. and Blase, J.J., Motivating Teachers: Understanding the Factors that Shape Performance. NASSP Bulletin. November, 1981.

Griffin, G.A., Effectiveness Research and Teacher Education: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University, Austin, 1981.

Grobe, R.P., Evaluation-What's It All About?, NASSP Bulletin. December, 1978.

Hall, C.L., A Study of Issues Involving Teacher Accountability and Evaluation. RIE. 1981.

Holt, H.B., Everything You Need to Know About Supervision. NASSP Bulletin. December, 1974.

Horine, L., Faculty Performance Evaluation: One Answer to Accountability Demands. Journal of Physical Education and Recreation. September, 1981.

Johnston, G.S., and Yeakey, C.C., The Supervision of Teacher Evaluation: A Brief Overview. Journal of Teacher Education. March/April, 1979.

Kimball, R.B., Six Approaches to Evaluating Teaching: A Typology. NASSP Bulletin. April, 1975.

Krajewski, R.J., Clinical Supervision In The Secondary School: Foundations For Principals. American Secondary Education. Fall, 1981.

Leese, J., Establishing A Relationship: Teacher Assessment and Consensus Preference. NASSP Bulletin. 1981.

Levin, M., Accountability: A Search For a Solution. Clearinghouse. February, 1979.

McIntyre, D.J., Administrators' Dilemma: Teacher Evaluation and the Observer Effect. NASSP Bulletin. April, 1975.

Marcotte, D.G., Evaluation: The Purpose is Communication. NASSP Bulletin. December, 1978.

Marks, M.B., Effective Teacher Evaluation. NASSP Bulletin. September, 1976.

Matczynski, T., and Rogus, J., Criteria for Program Analysis. NASSP Bulletin. April, 1975.

Meierdiercks, K., A Valuable Tool: Supervision and the Video Tape Recorder. NASSP Bulletin. November, 1981.

Munnelly, R.J., Dealing with Teacher Incompetence: Supervision and Evaluation In a Due Process Framework. Contemporary Education. Summer, 1979.

Murname, R.J., Interpreting the Evidence on School Effectiveness. New Haven Institution for Social and Policy Studies. Yale University, 1980.

Norris, W.R., Seven Premises for Improving Teacher Evaluation. NASSP Bulletin. April, 1975.

Pelliger, L.O., Providing Instructional Leadership-A Principal's Challenge. NASSP Bulletin. October, 1982.

Pembroke, E., and Goedert, E.R., What is the Key to Developing an Effective Teacher Evaluation System? NASSP Bulletin. December, 1982.

Reavis, C.A., Clinical Supervision: A Review of the Research. Educational Leadership. April, 1978.

Reavis, C.A., Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision. Phi Delta Kappan Fast Back No. 111. 1978.

Reinhartz, J. and Beach, D.M., The Principal: A Vital Component In Assessing Teacher Education Programs. NASSP Bulletin. October, 1982.

Robinson, J.J. and Lee, J.H., Evaluation: Can We Agree? NASSP Bulletin. December, 1978.

Sadler, N.J., The Appraisal Interview: Management Techniques for Evaluating Teachers. NASSP Bulletin. December, 1982.

Sapone, C.V., Appraisal and Evaluation Systems: What Are The Perceptions of Educators, Board Members? NASSP Bulletin. December 1982.

Savage, J.G., Teacher Evaluation Without Classroom Observation. NASSP Bulletin. December, 1982.

Smyth, W.J., Principal's Role In Teacher Evaluation: Rationale and Procedures. NASSP Bulletin. November, 1975.

Snyder, K.J., Clinical Supervision in The 1980's. Educational Leadership. April, 1981.

Stow, S.B., and Sweeney, J., Developing a Teacher Performance System. Educational Leadership. April, 1981.

Suprina, R.N., Supervision Do's and Dont's. NASSP Bulletin. December, 1978.

Sweeney, J., Planning Makes a Difference: Improving The Post-Observation Conference. NASSP Bulletin. December, 1982.

Thomas, D., The Principal and Teacher Evaluation. NASSP Bulletin. December, 1974.

Toran, R.A., Teacher Evaluation--One Practioner's Jawboning. NASSP Bulletin. March, 1982.

Tuckman, B.W., Feedback and The Change Process. Phi Delta Kappan.

Webb, L.D., Teacher Evaluation: Educators and the Law. Institute for School Law and Finance. 1983.